

**TOWN OF GILBERT  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
GILBERT MUNICIPAL CENTER, 50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE, GILBERT AZ  
JULY 1, 2015**

**COMMISSION PRESENT:** Chairman Joshua Oehler  
Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel  
Commissioner Brent Mutti  
Commissioner David Blaser  
Commissioner Carl Bloomfield  
Commissioner David Cavenee  
Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann  
Alternate Brett Young

**COMMISSION ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Services Manager Linda Edwards  
Senior Planner Bob Caravona  
Planner Nichole McCarty  
Planner Nathan Williams

**ALSO PRESENT:** Town Council Member Brigitte Peterson  
Town Attorney Jack Vincent  
Recorder Margo Fry

<b>PLANNER</b>	<b>CASE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>	<b>VOTE</b>
NATHAN WILLIAMS	S14-08	2	APPROVED
BOB CARAVONA	GP15-05	3	APPROVED
BOB CARAVONA	Z15-11	3	APPROVED
NATHAN WILLIAMS	GP15-04	4	APPROVED
NATHAN WILLIAMS	Z15-09	4	APPROVED
NICHOLE MCCARTY	GP15-01	11	APPROVED
NICHOLE MCCARTY	Z15-02	12	APPROVED

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Joshua Oehler called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Ms. Fry called roll and a quorum was determined to be present.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chairman Oehler asked if there was a motion to approve the Agenda.

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15

**A motion was made by Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel and seconded by Commissioner David Cavenee to approve the Agenda with the following changes: Move Item 6, S14-08 from the Consent Agenda to be heard first on the Non-Consent hearing. Move items 11, GP15-05 and 12, Z15-11 to be heard after item 6. Move items 9, GP15-04 and item 10, Z15-09 to follow the previous items. Items 7, GP15-01 and 8, Z15-02 to be heard after items 9 and 10.**

**Motion carried 7– 0**

## **COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS**

At this time members of the public can comment on items not on the agenda. The Commission's response is limited to responding to criticism, asking staff to review a matter commented upon or asking that the matter be put on a future agenda.

Chairman Oehler asked if there was anyone present who wished to comment.

No one came forward.

## **PUBLIC HEARING (CONSENT)**

Consent Public Hearing items will be heard at one Public Hearing. After the Consent Public Hearing, these items may be approved by a single motion. At the request of a member of the Commission or Staff, an item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and may be heard and acted upon separately. Other items on the agenda may be added to the Consent Public Hearing and approved under a single motion.

**None**

## **PUBLIC HEARING (NON-CONSENT)**

**Non-Consent Public Hearing items will be heard at an individual public hearing and will be acted upon by the Commission by a separate motion. During the Public Hearings, anyone wishing to comment in support of or in opposition to a Public Hearing item may do so. If you wish to comment on a Public Hearing Item you must fill out a public comment form, indicating the item number on which you wish to be heard. Once the hearing is closed, there will be no further public comment unless requested by a member of the Commission.**

**S14-08: PURI FARMS: REQUEST TO APPROVE PRELIMINARY PLAT AND OPEN SPACE PLAN FOR 63 HOME LOTS (LOTS 1-63) ON APPROXIMATELY 31.8 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF RIGGS ROAD, WEST OF THE RWCD CANAL AND NORTH OF SAN TAN BOULEVARD, IN THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL - 10 (SF-10) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

Senior Planner Nathan Williams said that he could give a presentation, however, he had spoken with the resident who wished to comment on the case and that he had a very specific question that he wanted on the record regarding the irrigation line.

Bradley Podany, Gilbert, AZ came forward. Mr. Podany said that he did not have any opposition to the plan and indicated on the exhibit the existing feed into his irrigation ditch on 156th Street. He said that he had spoken with staff and believed that they would make sure that if the developer puts in a new feed to that line there won't be any issues. He said that his concern was the schedule because anything south disturbed before that line is put in and he will have no water into his property. He said that he knew it was addressed by engineering but his concern was the developer being on board to the scheduling.

Chairman Oehler invited the applicant to come forward

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15

Drew Huseh, EPS Group, Mesa, AZ came forward. Mr. Huseh said that they had had intimate conversations with the neighbor to the North regarding the proposed development and the understanding and timing of the existing irrigation facility. The development of Puri Farms cannot and will not eliminate the existing irrigation lateral service and with the development of the community the new irrigation lateral alignment along the North will get a first in constructed as part of the development. They fully understand that maintaining Mr. Podany's irrigation's service during construction is extremely important.

**A motion was made by Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel and seconded by Commissioner Brent Mutti to approve S14-08, Puri Farms.**

**Motion carried 7 – 0**

Move to approve the findings and S14-08, Puri Farms, Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan for approximately 31.8 acres consisting of 63 single family lots, generally located south of Riggs Road, west of the RWCD Canal and north of San Tan Boulevard and zoned Single Family - 10 (SF-10) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to the following conditions;

1. The Final Plat for Puri Farms shall be in substantial conformance with Exhibit 4, Preliminary Plat approved by the Planning Commission at the July 1, 2015 public hearing and Exhibit 5, the Open Space Plan to be approved by the Design Review Board on July 9, 2015.

**GP15-05: FIESTA TECH LOGISTICS CENTER: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 16.73 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF COLORADO STREET AND DESERT LANE FROM GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (LI) LAND USE CLASSIFICATION; AND,**

**Z15-11: FIESTA TECH LOGISTICS CENTER: REQUEST TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 1625 AND REZONE APPROXIMATELY 16.73 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF THE INSECTION OF COLORADO STREET AND DESERT LANE FROM APPROXIMATELY 16.73 ACRES OF GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY TO APPROXIMATELY 16.73 ACRES OF LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (LI) ZONING DISTRICT.**

Commissioner Wittmann recused herself from the discussion.

Senior Planner Bob Caravona stated that the request was to change the general plan from General Commercial (GC) to Light Industrial (LI) and that is the same for the zoning request. The parcel is 16.73 acres to the centerline and staff is fully supportive of the request as well as Economic Development.

Chairman Oehler invited anyone from the public who wish to speak to come forward.

Bob Emmelkamp, Mesa, AZ came forward. He stated that he was a resident of Rancho Delmar which was about 500 homes across Country Club to the southwest of the proposed development. When WinCo moved into the neighborhood they tore out all of the trees next to Earnhardt and they went from a beautiful tree-lined street on Colorado to a street that is somewhat bare and they are hoping that the applicant will do what they can to get back to a tree-lined street before too long. Other than that he and his neighbors were in favor of the project.

Chairman Oehler closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15

**A motion was made by Commissioner Carl Bloomfield and seconded by Commissioner David Cavenee to approve GP 5-05 and Z15-11 subject to conditions in the staff report.**

**Motion carried 6 – 0**

Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann abstained from the vote.

- A. Recommend To The Town Council Approval Of Gp15-05, To Change The Land Use Classification Of Approximately 16.73 Acres Of Real Property Generally Located East Of The Intersection Of Colorado Street And Desert Lane From General Commercial (Gc) With A Planned Development Overlay To Light Industrial (Li) Land Use Classification; And
- B. For The Following Reasons: The Development Proposal Conforms To The Intent Of The General Plan And Can Be Appropriately Coordinated With Existing And Planned Development Of The Surrounding Areas, And All Required Public Notice And Meetings Have Been Held, The Planning Commission Moves To Recommend Approval To The Town Council For Z15-11 Rezoning Of Approximately 16.73 Acres Of Real Property Generally Located East Of The Intersection Of Colorado Street And Desert Lane From Approximately 16.73 Acres Of General Commercial (Gc) Zoning District With A Planned Area Development (Pad) Overlay To Light Industrial (Li) Zoning District.

**GP15-04: AVILLA TOWN SQUARE: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 16.15 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF GILBERT ROAD AND WARNER ROAD FROM 0.11 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 2-3.5 DU/ ACRE AND 16.04 ACRES OF GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS TO 0.43 ACRES OF UTILITY/ TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR (U/TC) AND 15.72 ACRES OF RESIDENTIAL > 8-14 DU/ ACRE LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS; AND**

**Z15-09: REQUEST TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 16.15 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF GILBERT ROAD AND WARNER ROAD FROM 0.11 ACRES OF SINGLE FAMILY 7 (SF-7) AND 16.04 ACRES OF GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) ZONING DISTRICT TO 0.43 ACRES OF PUBLIC FACILITY/ INSTITUTIONAL (PF/I) ZONING DISTRICT AND 15.72 ACRES OF MULTI-FAMILY LOW (MF/L) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

Senior Planner Nathan Williams stated that the request was for a General Plan Amendment and rezoning and was approximately 16 acres at Warner and Gilbert Roads. An aerial map was displayed and the main access at Civic Center was pointed out. The existing land use category is General Commercial (GC) and the request is that the land use be changed to 8 – 14 dwelling units per acre and Multifamily Low (MF-L). An exhibit was displayed showing existing SRP sites that will go from GC to UTC land use category and PFI. There are 152 units and the request is for MF-L. The project is somewhat of a hybrid between SF-A and SF-D units, single-story only. It is a multifamily type development because they are leasing the units and they are not for sale. MF-L is the best category for what the developer wanted to do. The main access will have a signal and there is a secondary ingress egress. The existing canal will be enhanced or improved through the CIP and is an amenity to which the developer is tied to. There are 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. The Planning Commission when previously reviewing the case made it clear that they wanted to see more of a buffer at the Eastern property line and the existing Settlers Point development. The building setback has been increased to 20 feet along the eastern property boundary. What is required in MF-L is 25 feet as well as a landscape setback and the applicant does not meet the landscape setback and it is technically at zero. They have provided a 20 foot building setback where 25 feet is required. The applicant meets all but the landscape setback along the arterial. Other deviations include some open space requirements such as a play area and they would like to make that more of an adult play area and they would like to eliminate the community center and make it an outdoor covered trellis type situation. Staff is comfortable with those deviations based on the type of unique market and use

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15

that they are pursuing. A graphic was displayed which showed that unit would have its own rear yard. All units will have at least 200 ft.<sup>2</sup> of private open space, 60 feet which will be covered. The units on the East will have a much bigger backyard. The applicant is under the open space requirement of 45% but they have a tremendous amount of private open space that they feel that their target market will prefer. They are providing individual units as opposed to apartment complex units. There are two trail connections on the North and one on the South. The site is within the hundred year floodplain area as identified by FEMA and the applicant has been working with a Town engineer in terms of a condition that would address that for future building permits. Mr. Williams noted that he had added to the staff report an amended version of Condition A and the applicant noted that they would prefer that condition be amended.

Commissioner Wittmann said regarding the revised Condition A added to the staff report which read “Any costs associated with the lowering / re-grading of Warner Road or any other off site area due to drainage requirements for the site’s floodplain requirements shall be borne by the developer” was it anticipated or expected that by the issuance of this that the regrading of Warner Road would be required?

Planner Williams said that the engineer for the applicant has proposed that as a remedy to let drainage flows across Warner so they would technically have to lower Warner to allow that to happen. Whether or not that would be a scenario to meet the requirements of the LOMR (Letter of Map Revision) was not a certainty. That was a potential mitigation possibility.

Commissioner Wittmann said that she believed this was the first time that they had seen this type of stipulation on a zoning case as typically it was handled on the back end. She asked if the code required something similar to this to be provided prior to a certain point in construction rather than adding it to the zoning case.

Town Attorney Jack Vincent said that it was not uncommon to condition development on certain off-site improvements being made. Typically they did not see a condition that looks like this but it is not uncommon to see a condition that requires any off-site improvements to be made that are necessary as a result of the impact that the development has on surrounding property. This would be an impact to Warner road and it would be appropriate to include such a condition in the zoning.

Commissioner Wittmann said that she understood the obligations or improvements to be made but for this specific site is a little building permit-ish. She said that she knew it takes a while to get a LOMR issued and asked if there was an anticipated idea of timing and what potential conditions might be provided.

Tom Condit, Town Development Engineer and Floodplain Administrator came forward. Mr. Condit said that this was a very unusual case and they typically do not see developments coming in where there is approximately 90% of the site in the floodplain. They have gone through an extensive process as the development plan has been brought in and the applicant has submitted to FEMA several weeks ago. It is typically a 3 or 4 month process to get an answer back from FEMA. With this particular case it is a two-step process where they will issue a conditional LOMR and then as long as all be conditions that FEMA places on the site are accomplished there is a resubmittal to FEMA and they issue the actual document that changes the floodplain. It is a lengthy process.

Commissioner Wittmann asked if the stipulation requires that just the letter be issued and the map not be revised.

Mr. Condit said that the code requires that every time a building permit comes in that is in a flood zone it be looked at in terms of whether the elevation is above the existing flood zone. The way that the CLOMR and LOMR is that until the LOMR, which is the second FEMA document, comes in the actual flood map does not change. The challenge for staff is that when a building permit is issued they have to look at the existing flood map that is in place even if a CLOMR has been approved they still have to look at the existing map which is in effect which is issued by FEMA.

Commissioner Wittmann asked if by the stipulation proposed currently that they are stating that they don't want grading permits to be pulled until the actual map has been revised or until the CLOMR has been issued.

Mr. Condit said that to clarify, the key is vertical construction of dwelling units that will be occupied. They will need to get a grading permit and make modifications to Warner Road potentially in accordance with the CLOMR in order to even resubmit for the LOMR so they will be issuing permits for those things ahead of time. It is the vertical construction of dwelling units that is the challenge.

Commissioner Bloomfield said that he agreed with what had been stated in the revision and what was stated in the staff report was inaccurate and would have caused hardship and the revision falls in line with what the developer was looking for. This project is uniquely different from anything that they have in the Town as the applicant is going to own every building that is there and will not be selling any of them. They could buy flood insurance in the meantime even if they are in a flood zone.

Mr. Condit said that the challenge was from his perspective in looking at the plan that is submitted and what the Planning Commission is considering approving is that if the flood map were not changed they would need to provide additional water storage on site and as the plan exist currently has no compensatory storage built into it. There is an option to allow some vertical construction but staff is hoping to see another site plan that allows for compensatory storage in the effect that there is no LOMR. They have been working with the applicant on that.

Commissioner Bloomfield said that he was comfortable with the revised amendment.

Chairman Oehler said that to encapsulate it what they were saying is that they could get the grading and drainage and any cut and fill with the amendment but that they couldn't go vertical at this point with how the amendment as written.

Mr. Condit said that they will need to have the CLOMR which is the first thing and what FEMA is reviewing currently which will take a few months. If the CLOMR is approved that is when they would issue the grading and other permits except the vertical construction. The LOMR is when the vertical construction permits are issued.

Chairman Oehler invited the applicant to come forward.

Brennen Ray, Phoenix, AZ, came forward representing the applicant. Mr. Ray thanked staff for their thorough presentation and said that this was truly a unique project of one story predominantly detached leased home community that is designed and feels like a single-family community. Due to discussions with staff it has been decided that the appropriate zoning category for the project, because it is a leased product, is within the multifamily low (MF-L) category. Mr. Ray said that they had a concern about Condition A in the staff report and still have a problem with the revised condition that was presented at the current meeting. With respect to the amended condition and the CLOMR and the timing of that and the ability to make the improvements and pull construction permits, the applicant was good with that. They also do not have any problems with the additional costs for the improvements including re-grading Warner Road. As staff has indicated, they are responsible for off-site improvements which are typical. He said that he might respectfully disagree with Tom Condit about how much of the site is within the floodplain there is never the less a significant impact on that. They have worked very closely with Mr. Condit and the engineering department and endeavored to receive input from the Maricopa County Flood Control District even though they are not a jurisdiction that has rights over what goes on in the Town they need to take a look at the project to ensure that they have a proper grading and drainage plan that allows them to be a safe secure development. In terms of the revised Condition A, specifically the Letter of Map Revision and that they have to obtain that LOMR before they can pull a building permit is problematic for them. They are left to the whimsy of FEMA. In a CLOMR they tell the Federal Government and the Town what it is that they are going to do from a grading and drainage perspective and go out and do the work. They then prepare as builds and that is what is submitted to FEMA in connection with the LOMR. They basically check the boxes and say "you told us what you were going to do and you did it and here's the proof that you did exactly what needed to be done." Mr. Ray said that

part of their frustration is that process could be from 3 to 6 months or even a year for FEMA to issue the LOMR. The applicant has a problem with not being able to pull a permit. From their perspective the stipulation need some massaging to be able to get Town staff comfortable with what they want to do and the applicant comfortable with what they want to do. He said that they would request the Planning Commission's recommendation that they be allowed to work with staff to work on additional details such as the potential of an alternate plan should the LOMR not be issued by FEMA. Mr. Ray said that they comply with the current floodplain maps and are one foot above the floodplain as the grading and drainage plan is today. It is somewhat more complicated as to why they are requesting it if they are already above it however, through research they have found an error in some of the analysis that was done and so they are correcting the analysis that was done. He said that they request the Commissions direction that they continue to work with staff to fine tune the stipulation relative to the LOMR and the issues that he outlined.

Commissioner Bloomfield said that he liked the project. He said that it appeared as though the applicant was okay with everything in revised Condition A up to the last sentence which reads "Additionally, developer shall obtain a letter of map revision (LOMR), and remove portions of the project from the floodplain as necessary to complete the project as proposed, prior to the issuance of any on-site building permit by the Town."

Mr. Ray said that was correct.

Commissioner Bloomfield said that it sounds like the applicant's recommendation is to issue the permit after the LOMR is submitted to FEMA. They would be doing a lot of work to do what the CLOMR says that they will do and then submitted back after they are as builds. He asked if that was the time that they were looking to have building permits issued.

Mr. Ray said that they do not see the need to pull the building permits before that Letter of Map Revision is submitted. He said that they should get the CLMR, do the work, get the as builds take care of, submit the LOMR back to FEMA for their approval and once that submission has taken place then have the ability to pull a building permit. He said that he did not have the time in a span of 45 minutes to craft a stipulation word for word that can be presented and know exactly how it reads.

Commissioner Bloomfield asked if the applicant would like to continue the case until next month to allow that opportunity to occur or would he want them just to strike that last one and send them to Town Council.

Attorney Vincent said that he wasn't totally sure that he understood what the alternative was.

Commissioner Bloomfield said to just remove the last sentence from the revised Condition A with the stipulation being so specific because the applicant is obviously and comfortable with that.

Attorney Vincent said that staff would need the Commission to set some very specific parameters on what they would like to see and what their recommendation would be to Town Council. Staff would not have the liberty to make certain decisions on its own because it is the Commission's recommendation to Council. He said that Planning Manager Edwards had some language to propose that may be a compromise.

Planning Manager Linda Edwards said that Mr. Ray outlined 3 points that were important to the development which were unoccupied double space, building permit and an alternative plan. In amended Condition A if they add as the last sentence "the exception is that a building permit may be issued for unoccupied double structures as approved by the Town Engineer as presented in an alternative plan." Those are the points that Mr. Ray was trying to make in that a building permit cannot be given until a LOMR has been received, however, it sounds as though the Town Engineer is okay with unoccupied double structures with the building permit as long as he has an alternative to look at the alternative plan keeping in mind that they believe that about 90% is within the floodplain. If they can have an alternative plan that shows that they are able to do some work on the property that would be okay.

Commissioner Wittmann asked how many unoccupiable structures there were considering this is all residential.

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15

Ms. Edwards said this would be a start on the project for grading and drainage, fences, potential Ramada's, open space areas, walls.

Chairman Oehler asked since they won't have a plat come to us since this is multifamily would they be stipulating to the general conformance. Where does that come into play if they have to make major changes to the site.

Ms. Edwards said that this is where the alternative plan is reviewed by the Town Engineer, where they are doing their work prior to FEMA's approval and presenting the things that they believe they can do without having to come back and redo them.

Chairman Oehler said would they have to come back before them if they got out of general conformance.

Ms. Edwards said if he was talking about the overall site as it is designed currently if it had to be revised substantially it would come back before the Commission. If there were minor amendments that were reasonable and the intent of the PAD development plan it would not come back.

Mr. Ray displayed a map that illustrated the current floodplain condition that exists on the property currently. He pointed out the FEMA floodplain. With respect to the plan that they have in place currently today the preliminary grading and drainage plan takes care of the compensatory issues that the Town is concerned about and would be able to build what they are proposing under the current conditions that exist on paper today. With the current studies they are one foot above what they are required to do to be out of that floodplain. Through their analysis they have found that there is a drainage condition that impacts a lot of the existing homes out there. They found errors in the analysis that were done to determine what is an appropriate flow and what water comes into the site and what goes out of it. Because of those errors they have submitted a fairly comprehensive training study that the Town Engineer has reviewed in conjunction with the Maricopa County Flood Control District. What they are proposing corrects the errors that existed in the current plan. What they are proposing is based on them getting the CLOMR and LOMR. They are agreeable that they should be able to pull the permit for a non-occupiable structure before the LOMR is made. Where they run into challenges is based on whether the building permit is based on an alternative plan. In their discussions with Mr. Condit they have talked about is that they would get an alternative plan that should FEMA not approve what they were doing Mr. Condit has an assurance that there is an alternative plan in place so that they can build it as presented currently to the Planning Commission. He said that he just did not want the condition of the building permit to be based on an alternative plan.

Commissioner Mutti asked if it was the applicant's desire to be able to pull building permits for all types of structures prior to the Letter of Map Revision recording or were they fine with only being able to pull them after the Letter of Map Revision records.

Mr. Ray said that he could not in good faith say that that is what they want because that is not the discussion that they had with Mr. Condit. What they would like is the ability to be able to pull building permits for non-occupiable structures and the ability to pull the permits for those buildings that are outside of the floodplain.

Chairman Oehler asked if that would be like a phased plan.

Mr. Ray responded that for practical purposes it would be.

Commissioner Bloomfield asked Mr. Condit if as long as you do the work that the LOMR and CLOMR rarely get kicked back.

Mr. Condit said that was correct. Generally speaking it is an administrative process and once you have done your homework and submitted the as builds and it is all in accordance with the CLOMR submittal that is almost always just an administrative review. Based on what Mr. Ray said about the Town issuing building permits for areas outside



of the flood zone for occupied structures he had no concerns about that it was only in areas that are in map floodplains.

Commissioner Bloomfield said that was not how it was worded in the staff report and that it says that they will not issue any for any of the projects and so that needed to be modified.

Mr. Ray said that they would like to be able to pull the building permits for non-occupied structures outside of the floodplain and for models and the leasing clubhouse.

Commissioner Wittmann asked if it was possible to add additional language to the stipulation that says that “with these parameters the applicant and Town representatives shall come to some sort of agreement prior to going to Town Council.”

Ms. Edwards said that she thought it was a good idea but that they did want to put into the record where they are trying to go so that those listening in would know the direction they are giving to staff. If she could read the direction that she was hearing it would give them some facts that they were zeroing in on. She read the following verbiage which would be at the end of the existing amended Condition A “the exception is that a building permit may be issued for an un-occupiable structure (such as a wall or fence) in a building permit may be issued for any building outside the current floodplain. And alternative or phased plan shall be approved by the Town Engineer for any building permit issued prior to the LOMR approval.” She said that there were 3 things happening. The LOMR is not going to be approved for 6 or 8 months or longer and they want to get the project started. The Town Engineer is comfortable with their being some grading, walls and fences and may be some occupied structures that are out of the floodplain today that would give a comfort level to start the project. That could occur before the LOMR is approved.

Mr. Ray said that they were headed in the right direction and the only thing that he would add to that is addressing the models and clubhouse component. He said that the Town Engineer was comfortable with including that provided that they have an alternate plan in place should it not be approved.

Chairman Oehler closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Wittmann said that she liked the revise plan and the setback increase along the east side and thought the product was unique to Gilbert and serves a different demographic than the traditional multifamily does. Because of the odd shape of the parcel, location and access and floodplain it has many special circumstances. With all of that in mind, the plan that they have come up with is a good one and it will be interesting to see how this product type develops. Commissioner Wittmann did not have any issues with the plan as proposed.

Commissioner Blaser agreed with Commissioner Wittmann’s comments. He said that he agreed with what was said about the CLOMR and LOMR and that the Town needed some assurance that all the requirements are going to be met. He said he was all for allowing the development to move forward in a manner by which the Town is comfortable.

Commissioner Cavenee said that the hardship of the site is some rationale for allowing some of the unique variances with this application. What was motivating to him was that they not only saw some taking in some areas but they have also seen some giving. The applicant heard what the Commission said in the previous session and that there were improvements made through that. Commissioner Cavenee echoed the agreement on Amendment A and said that they were headed in the right direction.

Chairman Oehler said that he thought the applicant heard what was said in Study Session and was trying to make a better development.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann and seconded by Commissioner Brent Mutti to move to recommend to the Town Council approval of GP15-04 a Minor General Plan Amendment.**

**Motion carried 7 – 0**

**A motion was made by Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann and seconded by Commissioner Carl Bloomfield that for the reasons set forth in the staff report, move to recommend approval to the Town Council For Z15-09, as requested, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report with revised Condition A to be further revised to permit ongoing discussion between the applicant and the town to agree upon the issuance of building permits for non-occupiable structures, occupiable structures outside the floodplain and potentially models and clubhouse. Continue that discussion and reach an agreement prior to Town Council.**

**Motion carried 7 – 0**

- A. Recommend to the Town Council approval of GP15-04, to change the land use classification of approximately 16.15 acres of real property generally located east of the northeast corner of Gilbert Road and Warner Road from 0.11 acres of Residential > 2-3.5 DU/ Acre and 16.04 acres of General Commercial (GC) land use classifications to 0.43 acres of Utility/ Transportation Corridor (U/TC) and 15.72 acres of Residential > 8-14 DU/ Acre land use classifications; AND
- B. FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL CONFORMS TO THE INTENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND CAN BE APPROPRIATELY COORDINATED WITH EXISTING AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OF THE SURROUNDING AREAS, AND ALL REQUIRED PUBLIC NOTICE AND MEETINGS HAVE BEEN HELD, THE PLANNING COMMISSION MOVES TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE TOWN COUNCIL FOR Z15-09 rezoning of approximately 16.15 acres of real property generally located east of the northeast corner of Gilbert Road and Warner Road from 0.11 acres of Single Family 7 (SF-7) and 16.04 acres of General Commercial (GC) zoning district to 0.43 acres of Public Facility/ Institutional (PF/I) zoning district and 15.72 acres of Multi-Family Low (MF/L) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay , subject to the following conditions.
  - a. ~~The development of this project is contingent upon: 1) obtaining a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and 2) complying with any and all conditions as stated by FEMA in the CLOMR. No building permits shall be issued until a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) is issued by FEMA, removing portions of the Project from the floodplain as is necessary to complete the project as proposed. Any costs associated with the lowering / re-grading of Warner Road or any other off-site area due to drainage requirements for the site's floodplain requirements shall be borne by the developer.~~ **Developer shall obtain a conditional letter of map revision (CLOMR) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) prior to the issuance of any grading permit or offsite construction permit by the Town. Developer shall comply with any and all conditions as stated by FEMA in the CLOMR, including the regrading of Warner Road or other areas shall be borne by the developer. Additionally, developer shall obtain a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) and remove portions of the project from the floodplain as necessary to complete the project as proposed, prior to the issuance of any on-site building permit by the Town. Ongoing discussion shall continue between the applicant and the Town to agree upon the issuance of building permits for non-occupiable structures, occupiable structures outside floodplain and potentially models and clubhouse. Discussion shall continue and agreement reached prior to Town Council.**

- b. At the written request of Gilbert, Developer shall dedicate all necessary easements for the roadway improvements, including easements for drainage and retention and temporary construction easements. Failure to dedicate said easements within thirty (30) days after the date of Gilbert's written request may result in the reversion of the zoning of the Property to the prior zoning classification.
- c. Developer shall create a Homeowner's Association (HOA) for the ownership, maintenance, landscaping, improvements and preservation of all common areas and open space areas, and landscaping within the rights-of-way. Maintenance responsibilities for common areas and open space areas shall be specified on the approved site plan or final plat.
- d. Developer shall record easements to be owned by the HOA for pedestrian, bicycle, multi-use or trail system purposes as determined by the final plat, at the time of final plat recordation, or earlier if required by the Town Engineer. In recognition of the modifications to the underlying zoning regulations set forth herein, such easements shall be open to public access and use.
- e. The Project shall be developed in conformance with Gilbert's zoning requirements for the zoning districts and all development shall comply with the Town of Gilbert Land Development Code, except as modified by the following:

	Proposed Development for Avilla Town Square (Z15-09)
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
Side (residential)	20'
Rear (non-residential)	10'
Minimum Landscape Setbacks:	
Front	20'
Side (residential)	0'
Rear (non-residential)	0'
Minimum Separation between Buildings	6'
Maximum Building Height (feet/ stories)	25'/ 1-story
Minimum Separation Wall Height	6'
Common Open Space (minimum)	42% of net site
Common Open Space Amenities: Enclosed Community Facility	1 non-enclosed, trellis patio amenity area of 1,000+ sq. ft.
Common Open Space Amenities: Children's Play Area	1 adult outdoor active amenity area of 400+ sq. ft. with turf area
Private Open Space (sq. ft.)	200 sq. ft. (60 of the 200 sq. ft. to be covered)

**GP15-01: COPPER LANDING: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 14.3 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF GUADALUPE AND MCQUEEN ROADS FROM COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL > 5-8 DU/AC LAND USE CLASSIFICATION.**

**Z15-02: COPPER LANDING: REQUEST TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 14.3 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF GUADALUPE AND MCQUEEN ROADS FROM COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL (CC) TO SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED (SF-D) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY.**

Planner Nichole McCarty stated that she had brought this case before the Planning Commission in May 2015 for study session and in June 2015 at which time it was continued to the current meeting. The summary of the request is to change the General Plan Land Use designation from Community Commercial (CC) to residential, 5 – 8 dwelling units per acre and the rezoning from CC to Single Family – Detached with a Planned Area Development Overlay. The subject property is located southeast of the southeast corner of Guadalupe and McQueen Roads in the northwest corner of the Town. The applicant is requesting a minor General Plan amendment and rezoning in order to develop single family residential. The proposed development is Copper Landing, a 14.3 acre gated subdivision with 90 single family detached auto-cluster homes. The overall density of the proposed development plan is 6.3 DU / Acre. The project has been planned to include a mix of one-story and two-story homes with attached two-car garages and the homes will range in size from 1,500 to 2,200 square feet. An aerial map was displayed and the surrounding uses were pointed out – a 3.3 acre parcel at the immediate hard corner at Guadalupe and McQueen Roads will remain Community Commercial (CC) zoning. The auto-cluster style of development that is being proposed consists of clusters of four to six detached houses that share a common driveway. The single family detached (SF-D) zoning category allows for a higher density product such as this, while maintaining a product that consists of individually owned units. The development plan proposes that the housing units that are adjacent to the internal roadways will have their fronts facing the street to help create an inviting neighborhood streetscape and to avoid only seeing the sides of houses. The landscape area being proposed is over the minimum requirement at approximately 22 – 24%. The community is gated with both entrances off of Juniper Avenue. As part of this project, the northern half of Juniper will be fully completed with sidewalk and curb and gutter. There are 180 spaces and two-car garages per unit with an additional 106 on street parking spaces which is above the required minimum. There are pedestrian connections to McQueen Road and Guadalupe Road. Ms. McCarty displayed a diagram of the proposed setbacks and the use and benefits easement concept. A 5 foot setback is proposed along the real setback for all of the lots and what is driving that is they are providing a wider drive aisle in the middle which should provide a more comfortable turning radius for vehicles getting into their garages. Miss McCarty referred to the following information from page 4 of the staff report:

Site Development Standards	LDC SF-D	Proposed SF-D PAD
Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft. per d.u.)	3,000	No change
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.)		
Front Yard Setback	10	<b>5 for Front (Livable/Alley) - Rear Lots only</b>
Side Yard Setback	0 or 5	No change
Rear Yard Setback	10	<b>5</b>
Maximum Building Height (ft. / stories)	36 / 3-story	<b>30 / 2-story</b>
Maximum Lot Coverage (%)		
One Story	60	No change
Two Story	50	<b>55(*)</b>
<b>(*) Based on the proposed residential product, it is anticipated that this lot coverage deviation will only apply to one of the two-story designs.</b>		

Miss McCarty said that the applicant had conducted two neighborhood meetings and the residents who attended were generally supportive. There was some concern about the commercial in the area and they wished to see more residential to help support what was already existing. The Chamber of Commerce has issued a statement that they are opposed to the down zoning and Gilbert Public Schools is very much in favor of the zoning. Miss McCarty displayed a Conversion Analysis and said that they looked at the saturation in the area and within 2 miles there were over 300 commercial buildings for lease or sale. Even if the parcel were to stay 17 acres of Community Commercial (CC) it would not attract a larger employer because of the CC zoning use restrictions and the 3.3 acres remaining on the corner would be feasible for a small commercial or office use. The population density in that area is very low compared to the rest of Gilbert at 2.3 persons per acre compared to 5.3. An aerial map was displayed depicting the data provided by the Economic Development Department. Miss McCarty noted that within the area defined as the Northwest corridor there are 42 parcels of vacant land zoned for Light Industrial (LI) use. Those parcels combined for 82 acres. The report provided by the applicant also stated that there are more than 850,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of LI on the Northeast of the subject site. The Economic Development Department found those figures were low and it is actually closer to 1.2 million sq. Ft.<sup>2</sup> in that area. The applicant provided another figure that as of June 1 there were 17,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of vacant commercial on the immediate Northwest corner of McQueen and Guadalupe and that number has actually gone up by approximately 6000 ft.<sup>2</sup> so now there is almost 23,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of available commercial in the immediate area. The Copper Landing General Plan narrative also stated that there was 2.2 million sq. ft. of vacant LI to the south on McQueen which staff believes they are referring to the Spectrum Development. That project is under development and will include 900,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> of commercial office space all of which is available currently for pre-lease. Staff believes that is an important aspect and that any commercial or new office user coming into the area would be driven to go into that space that is already under development. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the deviation requests.

Commissioner Mutti said that the deviation request to increase the lot coverage from 50 to 55 he understood to be because of a porch option. He said that he thought he heard in an earlier presentation that there is a 5% open air deviation that is allowed and asked if this would fall into that and therefore not be needed as another deviation.

Miss McCarty said that 5% open air does not apply to the subject zoning district and confirmed that the lot coverage increase was to 55% for a patio option on one of the two-story plan options.

Chairman Oehler said that staff had mentioned a two mile radius for lease or for sale and asked if those were occupied buildings.

Ms. McCarty said that those were vacant and included both vacant land and buildings.

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15

Chairman Oehler invited the applicant to come forward.

Brennen Ray, Phoenix, AZ, came forward on behalf of Northwest Holdings. Mr. Ray said that they believe that is appropriate for the 14.3 acres to be converted from Commercial to Residential. It is consistent with good planning principles and will provide a transition from less intense uses to the South with the large lot community and the church on the east to the more intense uses as they move northwest to the corner. This will provide additional rooftops in the area to support what is needed. Mr. Ray said that he believed that the request was consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. As was indicated, there is no neighborhood opposition and they appreciate staff's recommendation for approval and request the Planning Commission's approval as well. Mr. Ray indicated the site map and pointed out the areas that represent the 1.5 million sq. ft. of industrial employment in the area. He indicated the area that they believe contains another 1.8 million sq. ft. of vacant commercial land. He said that they believe that there was enough existing or proposed commercial in the area and residential makes sense. Mr. Ray noted that there is an enhanced landscape setback along the south side and along Juniper Avenue. There is an appropriate amount of buffering taking place from the future commercial as well as a significant amount of landscape on the north. From a street view they believe that it presents very well and has been laid out appropriately. Driving through the community you will be looking at the fronts of homes which is what is expected when you go into a single-family subdivision. Those homes are set back 10 feet and there will be some additional landscaping because of the parking spaces that are provided. They exceed the parking requirement. In terms of the rear yard setback the reason for that reduction is because they are providing a wider drive aisle. They are 5 feet greater on the drive aisle than Copper Ranch where they have had issues and Mr. Ray displayed an exhibit that demonstrated the turning radius. They believe that the justification and request for the reduction in setback is appropriate as well as the reduction in the setbacks for the livable portion only. With respect to Commissioner Mutti's question about what is driving the lot coverage, the result of that lot coverage is that there is one plan that if they look at the numbers and provide the bare minimum requirement of square footage and 60 ft.<sup>2</sup> of the patio space per the code they would be at a 47% lot coverage. With plan number 2537, when they get into adding a standard covered patio, that pushes them up over the 50% threshold. When they get into an option of providing an even bigger back covered patio it pushes them up to 54%. It is a desire to provide for the Arizona climate a greater ability for a patio and porch that drives the need on that particular floor plan thus the request for the increased lot coverage. The 5% open air allowance in code does not apply to that zoning district.

Commissioner Cavenee said that he understood that the product that is being shown is from KB Homes, however, there is no specific product proposed by them.

Mr. Ray said that was correct. At the study session the request was made to see some product so that they could see what it was going to look at. KB Homes have provided them with some concepts as to what might go on the lots.

Planner McCarty said that there has been some talk about a northwest employment corridor study but the Town's Economic Development Department has clarified that there is not going to be an actual study or report produced at this time. However the area is being "studied" on a regular basis. This site is still zoned Community Commercial so in order for any Light Industrial user to come in it would require an up zoning process.

Chairman Oehler asked if those numbers were based upon Light Industrial and Commercial.

Planner McCarty said that they were somewhat of a mix. The conversion analysis that they first showed was mainly focused on commercial because that is what they will be losing, however, because it got driven to the discussion of this being an employment user the data was focused on LI although there was one statistic about the immediate northwest corner which is a commercial figure.

Chairman Oehler closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Mutti said that he looked at the context of the neighborhood and they have a mix of single and multifamily that provided a nice middle-market. He said that he appreciated staff's presentation of saturation of

industrial and commercial and the suitability of this product. The support offered in the letter from the school compels him about improving the overall population density in that area. It feels appropriate and that it fits in well with the neighborhood and stated that he supported it as it was currently.

Commissioner Cavenee said he appreciated that it was an infill piece and suffered from that challenge and thought this was a good use for it and he agreed with the zoning. He was somewhat troubled that they were considering granting some very specific changes to the zoning that is proposed for product line that doesn't yet exist. If KB Homes never does the deal they have blessed this property was some pretty tight dimensions and that weighs him down somewhat. Otherwise it is a good use that fits the needs of the area. He just wished it wasn't so restrictive on the setbacks and the product that is being proposed for it.

Commissioner Wittmann said that she liked the design on the layout and in the past they have had issues with these types of projects with on street parking. The development plan seems to provide a lot of on street parking that seems to address potentially some of the issues that they have raised in the past about these cluster developments. She liked that it was more self-contained and had its own private access. It fits in well with the area and she would be supportive of the proposal as requested.

Chairman Oehler said that he was not as supportive of the change in zoning and he did not see the loss of commercial as an issue in the infill of the area. He saw a lot of numbers and knows the development in the area and thought they had a chance for change and more growth. There are areas that are challenged with movement of tenants but tenants come and go so occupancies come and go. If he was to be in favor of the request he would not want to base it upon renderings and drawings that they see for the models so they are not tied but are just as reference so the deviations would be a problem. Chairman Oehler said that he did like the site layout when it came to parking and that is something they have had issues with in the past but the deviations are not set, it's just that they have this builder.

Commissioner Wittmann said that her understanding was that they do have a builder who has floor plans that they intend to construct on the lots and they just have not yet been through Design Review Board. Elevations that are before them currently are conceptual in nature because they can't be stipulated to those specific elevations to the fact that they have not been to DRB. It's not that they do not know what they are going to get because that is the reason for the requests for 5% especially for the one plan.

Chairman Oehler said that they could go away and it says for reference in the drawings.

Commissioner Wittmann said that they would have to develop in substantial conformance with what was approved or they would have to come back before them anyway. The ordinance is the PAD and the ordinance is going to require specific conformance to that plan.

Chairman Oehler said that she was looking at the plan as a lot and the house is not part of that. They would be looking at giving approval for 90 lots and the plan itself not on the design itself.

Commissioner Wittmann said they could not do that because it has not been to Design Review.

Commissioner Cavenee said that he heard it differently and asked if KB Homes was part of this deal. He said they were interested and showed a sample product to provide the Commission an opportunity to see what it might look like. KB Homes could go away tomorrow just as easily as they could do the deal and they are granting variances that would run with the land regardless of what they put there.

Commissioner Wittmann said that happens with every case that comes before them because many of those deals are subject to approval of the zoning and if they don't get that approval they go away. In many cases the builders aren't in tow they are on the side lines guiding and watching the development come through.

Commissioner Cavenee said that he believed that was his point and that they were really giving a lot in this case. He said that he did think that residential was a good fit there but that they were allowing variances that would run with the land regardless of the builder.

Commissioner Wittmann said that as they do this they have to keep in mind the word zoning and that they can't be specific to users.

Brennan Ray said that KB Homes is in escrow currently to acquire the site.

Commissioner Blaser said that he believed it was a good fit and a good development and he would support it.

Commissioner Cavenee said that as much as he expressed concern given the nature of the infill and the residential he was supportive and not dissuaded by his concern.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann and seconded by Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel to move to recommend to Town Council GP15-01, Copper Landing, a Minor General Plan Amendment.**

**Motion carried 6 – 1**

**Aye - Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel  
Aye - Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann  
Aye - Commissioner David Cavenee  
Aye - Commissioner Brent Mutti  
Aye - Commissioner Carl Bloomfield  
Aye - Commissioner David Blaser  
Nay – Chairman Joshua Oehler**

**A motion was made by Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann and seconded by Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel that forced the reasons set forth in the staff report move to recommend approval to the Town Council for Z15-02, Copper Landing, as requested subject to the conditions in the staff report.**

**Motion carried 6 – 1**

**Aye - Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel  
Aye - Commissioner Jennifer Wittmann  
Aye - Commissioner David Cavenee  
Aye - Commissioner Brent Mutti  
Aye - Commissioner Carl Bloomfield  
Aye - Commissioner David Blaser  
Nay – Chairman Joshua Oehler**

- A. Recommend to the Town Council approval of GP15-01, to change the land use classification of approximately 14.3 acres of real property generally located southeast of the southeast corner of Guadalupe and McQueen Roads from Community Commercial (CC) to Residential >5-8 DU/AC land use classification; and
- B. For the following reasons: the development proposal conforms to the intent of the general plan and can be appropriately coordinated with existing and planned development of the surrounding areas, and all required public notice and meetings have been held, the Planning Commission moves to recommend approval to the Town Council for Z15-02 rezoning of approximately 14.3 acres of real property generally located southeast of the southeast corner of Guadalupe and McQueen Roads from Community Commercial (CC) zoning

**Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15**



district to Single Family Detached (SF-D) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the development plan reviewed by the Planning Commission July 1, 2015.
2. Developer shall create a Homeowner's Association (HOA) for the ownership, maintenance, landscaping, improvements and preservation of all common and open space areas and landscaping within the rights-of-way. Maintenance responsibilities for common areas and open space areas shall be specified on the approved site plan or final plat.
3. That development shall comply with the Town of Gilbert Land Development Code, except as modified by the following:

<b>Site Development Standards</b>	<b>Proposed SF-D PAD</b>
Minimum Building Setbacks (ft.) Front Yard Setback	<b>5 for Front (Livable/Alley) - Rear Lots only</b>
Rear Yard Setback	<b>5</b>
Maximum Building Height (ft. / stories)	<b>30 / 2-story</b>
Maximum Lot Coverage (%) Two Story	<b>55</b>

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

**Minutes** – Consider approval of the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of June 3, 2015.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Carl Bloomfield and seconded by Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel to approve the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of June 3, 2015.**

**Motion carried 7 – 0**

Appointment of Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) to assist Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport with their Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update.

**A motion was made by Vice Chairman Kristofer Sippel and seconded by Commissioner David Cavenee to appoint Chairman Joshua Oehler as liaison and Commissioner Carl Bloomfield as alternate to the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) to assist Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport with their Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update.**

**Motion carried 7 - 0**

## **COMMUNICATIONS**

**Report from the Chairman and Members of the Commission on current events.**

Chairman Oehler said that he wished to give condolences to the family of Mike Hurley who passed away.

Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting 7-1-15

### **Report from Council Liaison**

Town Council Liaison Brigitte Peterson announced that there was a President's award certificate for Exports given and four of those businesses were in Arizona with three of them being in Gilbert. One of those businesses was Wisdom Natural Brands with whom they celebrated last week another was Rigid Industries LED Lighting and they celebrated with them that morning and the third business is new to Gilbert and is Nancy's Frozen Yogurt and they are hoping to celebrate with them in the future. It's very impressive that out of 45 nationally three of those businesses happen to be right in our community. Public Safety and Gilbert Digital are pushing a safety campaign currently which is called Speed Down, Eyes Up, Drive Safely. Central Christian Church will be doing a fireworks display for Fourth of July and they are located at Lindsay and Germann. The Gilbert Fire and Rescue Department does an annual school supply drive every year to benefit Gilbert public school children in need. The drive runs through July 28th and there are donation bins at the Municipal Center and all of the fire departments.

### **Report from the Planning & Development Services Manager on current events.**

Planning Manager Linda Edwards thanked the Planning Commissioners for their expertise and service. She said that they have Living Spaces going into the property near Santan Mall located near Lesuers hay barn. Two other great projects are coming to the downtown area; Whiskey Row will be a very large building with outdoor spaces and two restaurant users. San Javier will be opening in August.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Oehler adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

---

Chairman Joshua Oehler

ATTEST:

---

Recorder Margo Fry